

Serial No. 09/771,389

Page 7

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-14, and 16-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 9, and 16 are amended, claims 17 and 18 are added and claims 7 and 15 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Office Action's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 7, 8, 15, and 16.

The Office Action objects to claims 2, 7, 10, and 15. This objection is respectfully traversed. Claims 7 and 15 are canceled, but incorporated into claims 1 and 9 respectively in a manner in accordance with the Office Action's suggestions to overcome the objections. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected for failing to limit the subject matter of the previous claims. Applicant disagrees. Applicant asserts claims 2 and 10 further limit the subject matter of the previous claims. In particular, claim 1 recites "performing... at least one of the steps of." Claim 2 recites "performing both the sending step and the transmitting step." Thus, claim 1 allows for performing only one of the steps or both of the steps. However, claim 2 only allows for performing both the steps. Claims 9 and 10 recite similar features. Thus, Applicant asserts claims 2 and 10 further limit the subject matter of the previous claims. Accordingly, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the objection to the claims.

The Office Action rejects, under 35 U.S.C. § 103, claims 1-6 and 9-14 over Dowling et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,239 B1) and Swildens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,706 B1). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure (MPEP 2142). The prior art must suggest the desirability of the claimed invention (MPEP 2143.01).

Serial No. 09/771,389

Page 8

Independent claims 1 and 9 are amended to recite the allowable features of claims 7 and 15, respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 9 define patentable subject matter. The remaining claims depend from the independent claims and therefore also define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under and 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6, 8-14, and 16-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any fees arising as a result of this Amendment or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew C. Loppnow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,314

Dated: October 21, 2004

Phone No. (847) 523-2585

Fax No. (847) 523-2350

Please send correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property
600 North U.S. Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048